



Finance & Infastructure Subcommittee Minutes February 4, 2016 Raging Sage Café 2458 N. Campbell Ave Tucson, AZ 85716

Participants: Forest Weir, Maia Ingram, John Anderson, Colby Henley

1. Call to Order, Introductions

Quorum established. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Forest Weier at 5:30.

2. Call to the Audience

No public in attendance.

3. Review and approval of minutes from the last meeting, approval process of minutes

John Anderson moved to approve February meeting minutes Maia Ingram seconded the motion. The Committee voted unanimously in favor of approving the meeting minutes.

Forest suggests changing the approval process to post the minutes rather than wait until the next approve them. This will allow us to share minutes with the PAC.

John made the motion to post the minutes rather then approve them at the next meeting. Maia seconded. Four ayes, no Nays, motion passed.

4. Discuss 22nd St. project

Discussion held about previous input into 22nd street as a safety corridor. John wrote a letter previously, but was waiting until the Bike / Ped program had broached the idea with mayor and council. Since that time the PAC program and policy committee did their assessment further demonstrating safety issues on this roadway. John will follow up with Ann about the letter and perhaps we could ask PAG report their response to the request at the next meeting.

5. Pedestrian Safety Action Plans and their funding

major issue with the plan is who is going to create it. It is doubtful that the CoT has the resources to do it, and it is not clear what resources that the FHSA has to contribute. The question for the committee is whether we find it worthwhile to spend the time doing this work. We need to nail down what the FSHA is offering. Also we could ask PAG if there are funds that they could contribute to this effort. Colby asks how is this different from the PAG plan. The PAG plan does not include residential streets.

It seems like the coordination of the plan would come through TDOT and administered through TDOT. We would recommend that the ped/bike program should not be in charge of developing the plan, but rather part of the process along with other stakeholders in TDOT.

Funding for the plan is also a consideration. Identified funding sources include routine accommodation in new projects (already part of RTA), dedicated funds/set asides (tax, fees), partnerships, annual maintenance budget of the city. John suggests that we think about the RTA funding being connected to this process. TDOT has a long list of roadway improvements that they want to do by jurisdiction that would be funded under the RTA. The pedestrian plan might inform the next step in terms of proposed projects. We would be doing the upfront work and then we would be ready when funding comes available. We would be pre-identifying projects.

The committee members discussed the fact that the work that LSA did in developing the bond proposal is a jump start for this plan b/c it identifies several priority project and considers crash data and connectors.

Committee members see value but want to clarify how much funding is available and how it would be produced.

6. Other Current Projects (Grant Road, 1st Avenue, Church Ave, etc.)

Nothing to report on Grant road. There was a meeting regarding noise generated by the new alignment has reduced the value of houses, and aesthetically changed the placement of their house. There is no longer a buffer for the residents. A lot of residents see the solution is a roadway and wall between that and the road, but from the planning perspective that is a dead zone. Hoping that where possible there can be buffer overlay zones rather than walls. There is not much we can do about widening.

However, there was another pedestrian crash on 1st ave where they plan to widen.

Local neighborhood is going after funding improvements for Treat as part of the bicycle blvd from neighborhood reinvestment. Apparently there is some money still available.

No action taken

7. Meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.